

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 11 due to various informalities. In response, Applicants have amended claim 11 to correct the informalities. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of this ground of objection.


Turning to substantive matters, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 11, 13-15, 17-20, 22-25, 27-30, 32-35 and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kolberg et al. (DE 198 28 992 C). In response, Applicants have amended claims 9, 14, 19 and 39. Therefore, claims 9, 11, 13-15, 17-20, 22-25, 27-30, 32-35 and 37-38 each recite that TiO₂ is present in amounts ranging from 0-0.5% by mass %. In contrast, the examples in the Kolberg reference teach that TiO₂ must be present in amounts of at least 1.0 % by weight (the actual values from examples 1-5 are, respectively, 7.0%, 5.0%, 1.0%, 1.2%, and 5.0%). Additionally, according to GB 2 338 954 A (the English language publication of the Kolberg reference), "the glasses contain from 1 to 7% by weight, preferably at least 4% by weight, of TiO₂." (Page 4, lines 5-7). Thus, Kolberg does not anticipate the glass composition recited in the claims as amended. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this ground of rejection.

With reference to claim 39 as amended, while Kolberg does disclose an optical glass, Kolberg fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a method of using an optical glass in which change in refractive index due to the compaction phenomenon is small for a lens of an optical system of i-line stepper. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of this ground of rejection.

In light of the foregoing applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the present application are in proper form for allowance.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


James V. Costigan
Reg. No. 25,669

MAILING ADDRESS

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
212-302-8989